arXiv:1106.5223v6 [cs.CC] 6 Jan 2012

Some results on equivalence of multi-letter quantum finite automata ☆

Tianrong Lin[a,*]

[a]Department of Computer Science, Fukien Normal University, Fuzhou 350007, China

---

Abstract

Two quantum finite automata are equivalent if for all input string ω over the input alphabet the two automata accept ω with equal probability. In [Theoret. Comput. Sci. 410 (2009) 3006-3017], it was shown that a k_1-letter QFA $\mathcal{A}_1$ and a k_2-letter QFA $\mathcal{A}_2$ over $\Sigma = \{\sigma\}$, are equivalent if and only if they are $(n_1+n_2)^4+k-1$-equivalent where n_i is the number of states of $\mathcal{A}_i$, $i=1,2$, and $k=\max\{k_1,k_2\}$. In this letter, we improve the above upper-bound to $(n_1^2+n_2^2-1)+k$. This also answers an open problem of Qiu et al. [Acta Informatica 48 (2011) 271-290]. Further, we show that, in the case of $\Sigma = \{\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_t\}$ with $2 \leq t < \infty$, there exists an integer z such that $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are equivalent if and only if they satisfy z-equivalent.

Keywords: Quantum finite automata, multi-letter quantum finite automata, equivalence

---

1. Introduction

Quantum finite automata (QFAs) are finite automata whose state transitions are governed by the quantum mechanics. There are two basic types of QFAs: *measure-once one-way quantum finite automata* [1] (MO-1QFAs) and *measure-many one-way quantum finite automata* [2] (MM-1QFAs). For the difference between the two models, we refer to [1–3]. In general, MM-1QFAs are

---

☆This paper was done while the author was a graduate student at Fujian Normal University.

*Corresponding author. Tel.:+8618359133282

Email address: `tianrong671@yahoo.com.cn` (Tianrong Lin) strictly more powerful than MO-1QFAs [3], where the power of a model refers to the acceptance capability of the corresponding automata. However, both MM-1QFAs and MO-1QFAs can only accept proper subclasses of regular languages with bounded error [3–5]. In this letter, we focus solely on another measure-once QFA model, the so-called *multi-letter quantum finite automata* (multi-letter QFAs) [6], which can be viewed as a generalization of *one-way multihead deterministic finite automata* [7] or that of MO-1QFAs (multi-letter MO-1QFAs). Multi-letter QFAs can accept the regular language $(a+b)^*b$ that can not be accepted by one way QFAs [6]. Moreover, Qiu and Yu prove that $k+1$-letter QFAs are more powerful than k-letter QFAs [8], where $k \geq 1$ is a fixed integer.

It is well known that, in classical automata theory[9, 10], the equivalence problem is very important. In [8], Qiu and Yu study the equivalence of multi-letter QFAs in case of unary languages, i.e., the input alphabet having one element. They showed that a k_1-letter QFA $\mathcal{A}_1$ and another k_2-letter QFA $\mathcal{A}_2$, defined on the alphabet $\Sigma = \{\sigma\}$, are equivalent iff they are $(n_1+n_2)^4+k-1$-equivalent, where n_i is the number of states of $\mathcal{A}_i$, $i=1,2$, and $k=\max\{k_1,k_2\}$. In addition, Li and Qiu [11–13] studied the equivalence problem for some other QFA models. In this letter, we study the equivalence problem of multi-letter QFAs with a different point of view.

2. Preliminaries and main results

Let Σ denote the non-empty finite input alphabet, $|\Sigma|$ the cardinality of Σ, and Σ^* the set of all words on Σ. The length of $\omega \in \Sigma^*$ is denoted as $|\omega|$. We use σ^n to denote $\omega = \underbrace{\sigma\cdots\sigma}_{n} \in \Sigma^*$. For undefined notations we refer to [8].

A k-letter ($k \geq 1$) QFA $\mathcal{A}$ is defined as a quintuple $(Q, Q_{acc}, |\psi_0\rangle, \Sigma, \mu)$ [8], where

- Q is a set of internal states and Σ is a finite input alphabet;
- $Q_{acc} \subseteq Q$ is the set of accepting states;

- $|\psi_0\rangle$ is the initial unit state that is a superposition of the states in Q;
- μ is a function that assigns a unitary transition matrix U_ω on $\mathbb{C}^{|Q|}$ for each word $\omega \in (\{\Lambda\} \cup \Sigma)^k$, where $\mathbb{C}^{|Q|}$ denotes the unitary space $\mathrm{span}\{|q\rangle | q \in Q\}$.

Starting with an input $\omega = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n \in \Sigma^*$, and with $\mathcal{A}$ in the initial state $|\psi_0\rangle$, then, according to the last k number of letter(s) received, $\mathcal{A}$ moves in succession into the states $|\psi_1\rangle = \mu(\Lambda^{k-1}x_1)\,|\psi_0\rangle$, $|\psi_2\rangle = \mu(\Lambda^{k-2}x_1x_2)\,|\psi_1\rangle$, $\cdots$. If $n < k$, the final state is $|\psi_n\rangle = \mu(\Lambda^{k-n}x_1\cdots x_n)\cdots\mu(\Lambda^{k-1}x_1)\,|\psi_0\rangle$. Otherwise, the final state is $|\psi_n\rangle = \mu(x_{n-k+1}\cdots x_n)\cdots\mu(\Lambda^{k-1}x_1)\,|\psi_0\rangle$.

It follows from the above discussion that ω induces an unitary matrix

$$\overline{\mu}(\omega) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} \mu(\Lambda^{k-n}\omega)\cdots\mu(\Lambda^{k-1}x_1), & n < k; \\ \mu(x_{n-k+1}\cdots x_n)\cdots\mu(\Lambda^{k-1}x_1), & n \geq k. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

and the final state of $\mathcal{A}$ can be rewritten as $|\psi_n\rangle = \overline{\mu}(\omega)|\psi_0\rangle$.

Let $P_{acc} = \sum\limits_{q \in Q_{acc}} |q\rangle\langle q|$. Then the accepting probability for ω is given by

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) \quad = \quad \|P_{acc}\,|\psi_n\rangle\|^2. \tag{2}$$

We state the definition of equivalence for two multi-letter QFAs as follows.

Definition 1 ([8]). A k_1-letter QFA $\mathcal{A}_1$ and another k_2-letter QFA $\mathcal{A}_2$ over Σ are said to be equivalent(resp. t-equivalent) if $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_2}(\omega)$ for any $\omega \in \Sigma^*$ (resp. for any $\omega \in \Sigma^*$ with $|\omega| \leq t$).

The following are our main results.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that* $\Sigma = \{\sigma\}$. *Let* $\mathcal{A}_i = (Q_i, Q_{acc,i}, |\psi_0^{(i)}\rangle, \Sigma, \mu_i)$ *be* k_i-*letter QFA,* $i = 1, 2$. *Then* $\mathcal{A}_1$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_2$ *are equivalent iff they are* $(n_1^2+n_2^2-1)+k$-*equivalent, where* $n_i = |Q_i|$ *and* $k = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$.

Remark 1. In a most recent paper [15], Qiu et al. obtained an upper-bound $n^2m^{k-1} - m^{k-1} + k$ for the equivalence of multi-letter QFAs $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ in the case of $|\Sigma| = m \geq 1$ where $k = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$ and $n = n_1 + n_2$ with $n_i, i = 1, 2,$

being numbers of states of $\mathcal{A}_i$. However, whether this upper-bound is optimal remains open in [15]. If we take $m = 1$, then it is clear that $(n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1) + k < [(n_1 + n_2)^2 - 1] + k$. Hence, Theorem 1 also answers an open problem of Qiu et al. [15].

Theorem 2. *Suppose that* $\Sigma = \{\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_t\}$ *where* $2 \leq t < \infty$. *Let* $\mathcal{A}_i = (Q_i, Q_{acc,i}, |\psi_0^{(i)}\rangle, \Sigma, \mu_i)$ *be* k_i*-letter QFA,* $i = 1, 2$. *Then there exists an integer* z *such that* $\mathcal{A}_1$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_2$ *are equivalent iff they are* z*-equivalent.*

3. Technical definitions and Lemmas

Let $\mathcal{A}_i$ be k_i-letter QFA over Σ, $i = 1, 2$, we define the "*diagonal sum*" of $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ as follows.

Definition 2. Let $\mathcal{A}_i = (Q_i, Q_{acc,i}, |\psi_0^{(i)}\rangle, \Sigma, \mu_i)$ be k_i-letter QFA, $i = 1, 2$. The *diagonal sum* of $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$, denote as $\mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$, is a k-letter QFA, defined to be

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2 \overset{\text{def}}{=} (Q, Q_{acc}, |\vartheta\rangle, \Sigma, \mu),$$

where $\mu \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mu_1 \oplus \mu_2$, $k = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$ and $Q = Q_1 \cup Q_2$ with $Q_1 \cap Q_2 = \emptyset$ and $|\vartheta\rangle$ is an arbitrary $|Q_1| + |Q_2|$-dimension unit column vector.

Remark 2. By $\mu = \mu_1 \oplus \mu_2$ we mean that the function μ assigns any $\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k \in \{\Sigma \cup \{\Lambda\}\}^k$ to a $|Q_1| + |Q_2|$-order unitary matrix $\mu(\omega)$ in the following manner ($k_1 \leq k_2$ is assumed)

$$\mu(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k) \quad \overset{\text{def}}{=} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1(\sigma_{k-k_1+1} \cdots \sigma_k) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_2(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k) \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to verify that $\forall \omega' \in \Sigma^*$, μ defined the unitary matrix $\overline{\mu}(\omega')$ on $\mathbb{C}^{|Q_1|+|Q_2|}$ as

$$\overline{\mu}(\omega') \quad = \quad \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\mu_1}(\omega') & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{\mu_2}(\omega') \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

Note that the initial state vector of the diagonal sum $\mathcal{A}$ is arbitrary. Of particular importance are the following two unit vectors

$$|\rho\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} |\psi_0^{(1)}\rangle \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad |\pi\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ |\psi_0^{(2)}\rangle \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4}$$

Concerning the vectors $|\rho\rangle$ and $|\pi\rangle$, we have the following

Definition 3. Let $\mathcal{A}_i = (Q_i, Q_{acc,i}, |\psi_0^{(i)}\rangle, \Sigma, \mu_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, be k_i-letter QFAs, let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2 = (Q, Q_{acc}, |\vartheta\rangle, \Sigma, \mu)$. Then the vectors $|\rho\rangle$ and $|\pi\rangle$, defined in Eqs. (4), are said to be equivalent (resp. t-equivalent) (with respect to $\mathcal{A}$) if

$$\|P_{acc}\,\overline{\mu}(\omega)\,|\rho\rangle\|^2 \quad = \quad \|P_{acc}\,\overline{\mu}(\omega)\,|\pi\rangle\|^2 \tag{5}$$

for all $\omega \in \Sigma^*$ (resp. for all $\omega \in \Sigma^*$ with $|\omega| \leq t$), where $P_{acc} = P_{acc,1} \oplus P_{acc,2}$.

We further introduce some notations as follows.

Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, Q_{acc}, |\psi_0\rangle, \Sigma, \mu)$ be a k-letter QFA. For $i \geq 0$, let $H_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$ denote the set $\{\,\overline{\mu}(\omega)^\dagger\, P_{acc}\,\overline{\mu}(\omega) | \omega \in \Sigma^*, |\omega| \leq i\,\}$, and $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \text{span}\{H_{\mathcal{A}}(i)\}$. For any $\omega = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n \in \Sigma^*$ with $|\omega| \geq k$, let $\eta(\omega)$ denote the $|Q|$-order unitary matrix

$$\eta(\omega) \quad = \quad \mu(x_{n-k+1} \cdots x_n) \cdots \mu(x_1 \cdots x_k). \tag{6}$$

For any $i \geq 0$, let $K_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$ denote the set $\{\eta(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc} \eta(\omega) | \omega \in \Sigma^*, k \leq |\omega| \leq k+i\}$, and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \text{span}\{K_{\mathcal{A}}(i)\}$.

Remark 3. It is clear by definition that, $H_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \subseteq H_{\mathcal{A}}(i+1)$ and $K_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \subseteq K_{\mathcal{A}}(i+1)$ for any $i \geq 0$. Evidently these imply that $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(i+1)$ and $S_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \subseteq S_{\mathcal{A}}(i+1)$.

With the above notations, we show first the following

Lemma 3. *Let $\mathcal{A}_i$ be k_i-letter QFA over Σ, $i = 1, 2$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$. If $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(l) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(l+j)$ for all $j \geq 1$, then the following assertions hold:*

1. *$|\rho\rangle$ and $|\pi\rangle$ are equivalent iff they are l-equivalent;*
2. *$|\rho\rangle$ and $|\pi\rangle$ are equivalent (resp. t-equivalent) with respect to $\mathcal{A}$ iff $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are equivalent (resp. t-equivalent);*

Proof. 1. The "only if" part is obvious by Definition 3. We proceed to show the "if" part. By hypothesis, $\forall\omega\in\Sigma^*$, we have $\overline{\mu}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega)=\sum_i a_i\big(\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)^\dagger P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)\big)$ where $a_i\in\mathbb{C}$ and $|\omega_i|\leq l$, and this implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega)|\rho\rangle\|^2 &= \langle\rho|\big(\overline{\mu}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega)\big)|\rho\rangle\\
&= \langle\rho|\left(\sum_i a_i\big(\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)^\dagger P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)\big)\right)|\rho\rangle\\
&= \sum_i a_i\left(\langle\rho|\big(\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)^\dagger P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)\big)|\rho\rangle\right), \qquad (7)\\
\|P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega)|\pi\rangle\|^2 &= \langle\pi|\big(\overline{\mu}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega)\big)|\pi\rangle\\
&= \langle\pi|\left(\sum_i a_i\big(\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)^\dagger P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)\big)\right)|\pi\rangle\\
&= \sum_i a_i\left(\langle\pi|\big(\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)^\dagger P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)\big)|\pi\rangle\right). \qquad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $|\rho\rangle$ and $|\pi\rangle$ are l-equivalent, i.e., $\langle\rho|\big(\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)^\dagger P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)\big)|\rho\rangle = \langle\pi|\big(\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)^\dagger P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)\big)|\pi\rangle$ for all $\omega_i\in\Sigma^*$ with $|\omega_i|\leq l$. This together with Eq. (7) and Eq. (8) lead to $\|P_{acc}\,\overline{\mu}(\omega)|\rho\rangle\|^2=\|P_{acc}\,\overline{\mu}(\omega)|\pi\rangle\|^2$ for all $\omega\in\Sigma^*$, as required.

2. Note that, the left side of Eq. (5) is $\|P_{acc,1}\overline{\mu_1}(\omega)|\psi_0^{(1)}\rangle\|^2$, i.e., $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega)$; and the right side of Eq. (5) is $\|P_{acc,2}\overline{\mu_2}(\omega)|\psi_0^{(2)}\rangle\|^2$, i.e., $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_2}(\omega)$. Thus, $|\rho\rangle$ and $|\pi\rangle$ are equivalent (resp. t-equivalent) implies that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega)=\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_2}(\omega)$ for all $\omega\in\Sigma^*$ (resp. $\forall\omega\in\Sigma^*$ with $|\omega|\leq t$), i.e., $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are equivalent (resp. t-equivalent); and vice versa. ■

Remark 4. The method that reducing the equivalence problem of two multi-letter QFAs to that of two initial vectors used in the proof of Lemma 3 may appear first in [14] (cf. Theorem 1, [14]).

4. Proof of Theorem 1

To show theorem 1, the following Lemma 4 is needed.

Lemma 4. *Suppose that* $\Sigma=\{\sigma\}$. *Let* $\mathcal{A}_i$ *be* k_i*-letter QFA over* Σ, $i=1,2$. *Let* $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}_1\oplus\mathcal{A}_2$. *Then* $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}((n_1^2+n_2^2-1)+k)=\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}((n_1^2+n_2^2-1)+k+j)$ *for all* $j\geq 1$, *where* $k=\max\{k_1,k_2\}$.

To prove Lemma 4, we show first the following

Lemma 5. *Suppose that $\Sigma = \{\sigma\}$. Let $\mathcal{A}_i$ be k_i-letter QFA over Σ, $i = 1, 2$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$. Then, there exists an integer $l < n_1^2 + n_2^2$, such that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(l) = \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(l + j)$ for all $j \geq 1$.*

Remark 5. Note first that, if $\mathcal{A}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, are k_i-letter QFAs over $\Sigma = \{\sigma\}$, and $\mathcal{A}$ is the diagonal sum of $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$, then one can easy verify that

$$\eta(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_1(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc,1}\eta_1(\omega) & 0 \\ 0 & \eta_2(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc,2}\eta_2(\omega) \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\eta_i(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc,i}\eta_i(\omega)$, $i = 1, 2$, are n_i-order matrices, respectively. This implies that $\dim\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \leq n_1^2 + n_2^2$ for all $i \geq 0$.

We can now give the proof of Lemma 5 as follows.

Proof of Lemma 5. We show first that there exists an integer $l < n_1^2 + n_2^2$, such that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(l) = \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(l + 1)$. Otherwise, $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \neq \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(i + 1)$ for all $i \geq 0$, which means that

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(0) \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(n_1^2 + n_2^2) \subset \cdots \subseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(i).$$

Recall that $\dim(\bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(i)) \leq n_1^2 + n_2^2$ (by Remark 5), and $\dim\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(0) \geq 1$, we have $\dim\mathcal{S}(n_1^2 + n_2^2) \geq n_1^2 + n_2^2 + 1$, which is a contradiction.

We show next that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(l) = \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(l + j)$ for all $j \geq 1$ by induction on j. For $j = 1$, we have done. Assume it is true for $j < m$, $(m > 1)$, and consider the case $j = m$. Recall that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(l + m) = \mathrm{span}\{K_{\mathcal{A}}(l + m)\}$. For our purpose it suffices to prove that, for all $\eta(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\omega) \in K_{\mathcal{A}}(l + m)$, it can be represented as

$$\eta(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\omega) \quad = \quad \sum_i a_i \left(\eta(\omega_i)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\omega_i)\right)$$

where $\eta(\omega_i)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\omega_i) \in K_{\mathcal{A}}(l + (m - 1))$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{C}$. Note that $K_{\mathcal{A}}(l + m) = K_{\mathcal{A}}(l + (m - 1)) \cup \{\eta(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\omega) | \omega \in \Sigma^*, |\omega| = k + l + m\}$ and $\{\eta(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\omega) | \omega \in$

$\Sigma^*, |\omega| = k+l+m\} = \{\eta(\sigma^{k+l+m})^\dagger P_{acc}\,\eta(\sigma^{k+l+m})\}$ ($\because \Sigma = \{\sigma\}$). By Eq. (6), we have

$$\eta(\sigma^{k+l+m})^\dagger P_{acc}\,\eta(\sigma^{k+l+m}) \quad = \quad \mu(\sigma^k)^\dagger \left(\eta(\sigma^{k+l+(m-1)})^\dagger P_{acc}\,\eta(\sigma^{k+l+(m-1)})\right)\mu(\sigma^k).$$

By induction hypothesis, we have

$$\eta(\sigma^{k+l+(m-1)})^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\sigma^{k+l+(m-1)}) = \sum_j b_j\left(\eta(\omega_j)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\omega_j)\right)$$

where $\omega_j = \sigma^{|\omega_j|}$ with $k \le |\omega_j| \le k+l$ and $b_j \in \mathbb{C}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\eta(\sigma^{k+l+m})^\dagger P_{acc}\,\eta(\sigma^{k+l+m}) &= \mu(\sigma^k)^\dagger\left(\sum_j b_j\left(\eta(\omega_j)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\omega_j)\right)\right)\mu(\sigma^k)\\ &= \sum_j b_j\left(\eta(\sigma^{|\omega_j|+1})^\dagger P_{acc}\,\eta(\sigma^{|\omega_j|+1})\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\eta(\sigma^{|\omega_j|+1})^\dagger P_{acc}\,\eta(\sigma^{|\omega_j|+1}) \in K_{\mathcal{A}}(l+(m-1))$, as needed. ■

Let $\gamma(\sigma) = \mu(\Lambda\sigma^{k-1})\cdots\mu(\Lambda^{k-2}\sigma^2)\mu(\Lambda^{k-1}\sigma)$. Then for $i \ge k$, we have $H_{\mathcal{A}}(i) = H_{\mathcal{A}}(k-1) \cup \Big(H_{\mathcal{A}}(i)\backslash H_{\mathcal{A}}(k-1)\Big)$. Note that:

$$\begin{aligned}H_{\mathcal{A}}(i)\backslash H_{\mathcal{A}}(k-1) &= \{\overline{\mu}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega) | \omega \in \Sigma^*, k \le |\omega| \le k+(i-k)\}\\ &= \gamma(\sigma)^\dagger K_{\mathcal{A}}(i-k)\gamma(\sigma).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$H_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \quad = \quad H_{\mathcal{A}}(k-1) \cup \left(\gamma(\sigma)^\dagger K_{\mathcal{A}}(i-k)\gamma(\sigma)\right).$$

We now proceed to show Lemma 4.

Proof of Lemma 4. For any $\overline{\mu}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega) \in H_{\mathcal{A}}((n_1^2+n_2^2-1)+k+j)$ with $(n_1^2+n_2^2-1)+k < |\omega| \le (n_1^2+n_2^2-1)+k+j$. It is clear that

$$\overline{\mu}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega) \quad = \quad \gamma(\sigma)^\dagger\left(\eta(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\omega)\right)\gamma(\sigma).$$

By Lemma 5,

$$\eta(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\omega) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}((n_1^2+n_2^2-1)+j) = \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}(n_1^2+n_2^2-1).$$

Hence,

$$\eta(\omega)^{\dagger} P_{acc}\eta(\omega) \quad = \quad \sum_i b_i \left(\eta(\omega_i)^{\dagger} P_{acc}\eta(\omega_i)\right)$$

where $\omega_i = \sigma^{|\omega_i|}$ with $k \leq |\omega_i| \leq (n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1) + k$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mu}(\omega)^{\dagger} P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega) &= \gamma(\sigma)^{\dagger} \left(\sum_i b_i \left(\eta(\omega_i)^{\dagger} P_{acc}\eta(\omega_i)\right) \right) \gamma(\sigma) \\ &= \sum_i b_i \left(\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)^{\dagger} P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega_i)\right), \end{aligned}$$

which means that

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}((n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1) + k + j) \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}((n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1) + k). \tag{9}$$

(9) together with Remark 3 give that

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}((n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1) + k + j) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}((n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1) + k).$$

The lemma follows. ■

Combing Lemma 3 and Lemma 4, then Theorem 1 follows.

5. Proof of Theorem 2

We show first the following

Lemma 6. *Suppose that* $\Sigma = \{\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_t\}$ *with* $2 \leq t < \infty$. *Let* $\mathcal{A}_i$ *be* k_i*-letter QFA over* Σ, $i = 1, 2$. *Let* $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$. *Then, there exists an integer* z *such that* $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(z) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(z + j)$ *for all* $j \geq 1$.

Proof. By using the same argument that we used in the proof of Lemma 5, we see that there exists an integer $z_1 < n_1^2 + n_2^2$ (where $n_i = |Q_i|$, $i = 1, 2$), such that $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(z_1) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(z_1 + 1)$. If $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(z_1 + 1) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(z_1 + j)$ for all $j \geq 2$, then taking $z = z_1$ we can complete the proof; Otherwise, there must exists an another integer $> z_1$, say z_2, such that

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(z_1 + 1) = \cdots = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(z_2 - 1) \subset \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(z_2).$$

Similarly, if $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(z_2) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(z_2 + j)$ for all $j \geq 1$, then taking $z = z_2$ we can finish the proof. Otherwise, repetition of the procedure just used, we can obtain an index set, say $\Gamma = \{z_1, z_2, \cdots\}$, such that

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(z_1) \subset \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(z_2) \subset \cdots \subseteq \mathrm{span}\{\mathcal{B}\}.$$

Since $\dim \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}(z_1) \geq 1$ and $\dim\{\mathcal{B}\} = n_1^2 + n_2^2$, this implies that the index set Γ is finite and $|\Gamma| \leq n_1^2 + n_2^2$, i.e., $\Gamma = \{z_1, z_2, \cdots, z_l\}$ for some $l \leq n_1^2 + n_2^2$. Taking $z = z_l$, this ends the proof of the lemma. ■

Finally, Theorem 2 follows from Lemma 3 and Lemma 6.

6. Conclusions

In this letter, we show that, in the case of $\Sigma = \{\sigma\}$, $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are equivalent if and only if they are $(n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1) + k$-equivalent. This upper-bound is quadratic better than the one give in [8]. This also answers an open problem of Qiu et al. [15]. In case of $\Sigma = \{\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_t\}$ with $2 \leq t < \infty$, we show the existence of the integer z such that $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are equivalent if and only if they are z-equivalent. Finally, the optimal upper-bound of the integer z is an important issue worthy of future investigation and it is our future work to consider the issue.

References

[1] C. Moore, J.P. Crutchfield, Quantum automata and quantum grammars, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 237, 2000, 275-306.

[2] A. Kondacs, J. Watrous, On the power of quantum finite state automata, in: Proc. 38th IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 1997, pp. 66-75.

[3] A. Brodsky, N. Pippenger, Characterizations of 1-way quantum finite automata, SIAM J. Comput. 31 (5), 1456-1478, 2002.

[4] A. Ambainis, R. Freivalds, One-way quantum finite automata: Strengths, weaknesses and generalizations, in: Proc. 39th IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 1998, pp. 332-341.

[5] A. Yakaryilmaz, A.C. Cem Say, Unbounded-eorror quantum computation with small space bounds, Inf. Comput. 209 (2011) 873-892.

[6] A. Belovs, A. Rosmanis, J. Smotrovs, Multi-letter reversible and quantum finite automata, in: LNCS, vol.4588, Springer, Berlin, 2007, pp. 60-71.

[7] J. Hromkovic, One-way multihead deterministic finite autoamta, Acta. Informatica 19, 1983, pp. 377-384.

[8] Daowen Qiu, Sheng Yu, Hierarchy and equivalence of multi-letter quantum finite automata, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 410 (2009) 3006-3017.

[9] J.E. Hopcroft, J.D. Ullman, Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation, Addision-Wesley, New York, 1979.

[10] S. Eilenberg, Automata, Languages and Machines. Vol A, Academic Press, New York, 1974.

[11] Lvzhou Li, Daowen Qiu, Determining the equivalence for one-way quantum finite automata, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 403 (2008) 42-51.

[12] Lvzhou Li, Daowen Qiu, Determination of equivalence between quantum sequential machines, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 358 (2006) 65-74.

[13] Lvzhou Li, Daowen Qiu, A note on quantum sequential machines, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 410 (2009) 2529-2535.

[14] J.W. Carlyle, Reduced forms for stochastic sequential machines, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 7 (1963) 167-175.

[15] Daowen Qiu, Lvzhou Li et al., Multi-letter quantum finite automata: decidability of the equivalence and minimization of states, Acta Informatica 48 (2011) 271-290.